Caaee331144cov-03339855-JID Domcumentt109 Filed 0339228/1155 Praggel 10644

1	COLT / SINGER / BEA LLP	DURIE TANGRI LLP	
2	Benjamin L. Singer (Cal. Bar No. 264295) bsinger@coltsinger.com	Michael H. Page (Cal. Bar No. 154913) mpage@durietangri.com	
3	Renee B. Bea (Cal. Bar No. 268807) rbea@coltsinger.com	217 Leidesdorff Street San Francisco, California, 94111	
4	Douglas S. Tilley (Cal. Bar No. 265997) dtilley@coltsinger.com	+1 (415) 362-6666 +1 (415) 236-6300 facsimile	
5	601 Montgomery Street, Suite 1950 San Francisco, California, 94111	Attorneys for Defendant Orange, S.A.	
	+1 (415) 500-6080		
6	+1 (415) 500-6080 facsimile	FOLEY HOAG LLP Daniel Schimmel (pro hac vice)	
7	WARREN LEX LLP Matthew S. Warren (Cal. Bar No. 230565)	dschimmel@foleyhoag.com 1177 Avenue of the Americas	
8	Patrick M. Shields (Cal. Bar No. 204739) Erika H. Mayo (Cal. Bar No. 295570)	New York, New York, 10036 +1 (646) 927-5500	
9	14-3985@cases.warrenlex.com 2261 Market Street, No. 606	+1 (646) 927-5599 facsimile	
10	San Francisco, California, 94114 +1 (415) 895-2940	Attorneys for Defendants	
11	+1 (415) 895-2964 facsimile		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Telesocial Inc.		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
- '	T(ORTHERT DISTRE	ier or each ordan	
15		SCO DIVISION	
15			
15 16	SAN FRANCIS	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD	
15 16 17	SAN FRANCIS TELESOCIAL INC.,	SCO DIVISION	
15 16 17 18	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO	
15 16 17 18 19	SAN FRANCIS TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual; BARBARA BOBILLIER, an individual; BENOIT AMET, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual; BARBARA BOBILLIER, an individual; BENOIT AMET, an individual; THOMAS LESENECHAL, an individual; FLORIAN DE SA, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual; BARBARA BOBILLIER, an individual; BENOIT AMET, an individual; THOMAS LESENECHAL, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual; BARBARA BOBILLIER, an individual; BENOIT AMET, an individual; THOMAS LESENECHAL, an individual; FLORIAN DE SA, an individual; ANTOINE LECOUTTEUX, an individual;	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	TELESOCIAL INC., Plaintiff, v. ORANGE S.A., a French Corporation; ANNE BENRIKHI, an individual; DIMITRI DELMAS, an individual; OLIVIER GODINIAUX, an individual; GUILLAUME GUIMOND, an individual; FABRICE PETESCH, an individual; JACQUES VIEL, an individual; BARBARA BOBILLIER, an individual; BENOIT AMET, an individual; THOMAS LESENECHAL, an individual; FLORIAN DE SA, an individual; ANTOINE LECOUTTEUX, an individual; and SYLVAIN JAUDRY, an individual,	SCO DIVISION CASE NO. 3:14-CV-3985-JD STIUPLATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER; AND	

Case 31144 cov 0339455 JID Dominmentt 109 Filed 099 228 1155 Pragge 2 2 6 4 4

1	Pursuant to Rule 7-12 of the Northern District of California Civil Local Rules, Plaintiff	
2	Telesocial Inc. and Defendants Orange, S.A., Anne Benrikhi, Dmitri Delmas, Olivier Godiniaux,	
3	Guillaume Guimond, Fabrice Petesch, Jacques Viel, Barbara Bobillier, Benoit Amet, Thomas	
4	Lesenechal, Florian De Sa, and Antoine Lecoutteux (collectively "Defendants"), by and through	
5	their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:	
6	WHEREAS on June 2, 2015, Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus relating t	
7	this Court's Order Denying Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 85) ("the Petition");	
8	WHEREAS on June 8, 2015, at Defendants' request, the Ninth Circuit entered a stay of	
9	discovery in this action pending review of the Petition;	
10	WHEREAS on August 11, 2015, the Ninth Circuit issued notice setting oral argument on	
11	the Petition for October 19, 2015;	
12	WHEREAS, pursuant to the December 10, 2014 Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 35) and this	
13	Court's Standing Order for Civil Trials, several case management deadlines have already elapsed	
14	and the parties' pretrial filings are currently due in October 2015, before the parties can	
15	realistically expect a decision from the Ninth Circuit on the Petition; and	
16	WHEREAS, in light of the foregoing, the parties agree it would be in the interest of	
17	judicial economy to postpone all outstanding pretrial and trial dates pending resolution of the	
18	Petition and the associated stay of discovery;	
19	//	
20	//	
21	//	
22	//	
23	//	
24	//	
25	//	
26	//	
27	//	
28	//	

1	NOW, THEREFORE, the parties jointly stipulate and request that the dates in the current		
2	Scheduling Order be taken off calendar pending further order of the Court. In the event the case is		
3	remanded to this Court by the Ninth Circuit, the parties shall submit a joint case management		
4	conference statement within fifteen (15) days of any order by the Ninth Circuit dissolving the stay		
5	of discovery.		
6	Date: September 22, 2015 WARREN LEX LLP		
7	/s/ Patrick M. Shields Patrick M. Shields		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff Telesocial Inc.		
9			
10	Date: September 22, 2015 FOLEY HOAG LLP		
11	/s/ Daniel Schimmel Daniel Schimmel (pro hac vice)		
12	Attorneys for Defendants		
13			
14	Date: September 22, 2015 DURIE TANGRI LLP		
15	<u>/s/ Michael H. Page</u> Michael H. Page		
16	Attorneys for Defendant Orange, S.A.		
17			
18			
19	<u>ATTESTATION OF SIGNATURE</u>		
20	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that Michael H. Page and Daniel Schimmel,		
21	counsel for Defendants, have concurred in this filing and have authorized me to file this document		
22	including their signatures.		
23	/s/ Patrick M. Shields Patrick M. Shields		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	-3- No. 3:14-CV-3985	-JD	

STIPULATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE SCHEDULING ORDER

[PROPOSED] ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, all deadlines triggered by the December 10, 2014
Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 35) are hereby taken off calendar pending further order of this Court.
In the event the case is remanded to this Court by the Ninth Circuit, the parties shall submit a joint case management conference statement within fifteen (15) days of any order by the Ninth Circuit dissolving the stay of discovery in this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 28, 2015

